



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/933,956

08/21/2001

Ramesh R. Sarukkai

YAHOO-01007US0

7521

23910

7590

09/01/2006

FLIESLER MEYER, LLP
FOUR EMBARCADERO CENTER
SUITE 400
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

EXAMINER

WOZNIAK, JAMES S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2626

DATE MAILED: 09/01/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/933,956

Applicant(s)

SARUKKAI, RAMESH R.

Examiner

James S. Wozniak

Art Unit

2626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 March 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 7, 8, 10-14, 26, 28, 30 and 32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 7, 8, 10-14, 26, 28, 30 and 32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 August 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. In response to the office action from 9/27/2005, the applicant has submitted a request for continued examination, filed 3/27/2006, amending claims 1-4, 7-8, 26, 28, and 30, while adding claims 32 and arguing to traverse the art rejection based on the amended limitations (*Amendment, Pages 9-10*). Applicant's arguments have been fully considered, however the previous rejection is maintained, altered with respect to the amended claims and due to the reasons listed below in the response to arguments.
2. In response to the amendment of claims 7-8 and 30, the examiner has withdrawn the previous objections directed towards a lack of proper antecedent basis.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive for the following reasons:

With respect to **Claims 1, 4, 26, and 32**, the applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references. In response to such arguments, the examiner directs the

applicant to the current art rejections, which have been altered with respect to the presently amended claims. Also, in response to the applicant's argument that Ladd et al (*U.S. Patent: 6,269,336*) fails to teach an identification associated with a prerecorded audio file (*Amendment, Page 9*), the examiner points out that Ladd discloses a prompt tag element associated with a prompt that may be in the form of a recorded audio file (*Col. 15, Line 60- Col. 16, Line 40*).

The further dependent claims further limit rejected independent claims, and thus, also remain rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. **Claims 1, 3-5, 7-8, 12-14, 26, 28, and 30** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ladd et al (*U.S. Patent: 6,269,336*).

With respect to **Claim 1**, Ladd discloses:

Receiving a request for information (*Col. 4, Lines 37-49; Fig. 2, Element 156; Col. 10, Lines 12-21*);

Obtaining the information (*obtaining information in the form of an audio prompt, Col. 10, Line 58- Col. 11, Line 11*), the information comprising prompt mapping information and

prompt content (*audio prompt information comprising prompt mapping contained in a tree structure, Col. 12, Line 15- Col. 13, Line 65; Fig. 7; and prompt element tags defining prompt content, Col. 16, Lines 29-40; Col. 18, Lines 34-45; and Fig. 6*); and

Executing the obtained information, wherein executing includes interpreting at least a portion of the prompt content using at least a portion of the prompt mapping information (*issuing a prompt based upon the tree mapping, state, and content information, Col. 13, Lines 42-65; Col. 16, Lines 5-40; Col. 18, Lines 34-45; and Fig. 6*).

With respect to **Claim 3**, Ladd discloses:

The communication device is one of a standard telephone, a cellular telephone, and a personal digital assistant (*Col. 6, Lines 37-49; and Col. 7, Lines 25-33*).

With respect to **Claim 4**, Ladd discloses:

The prompt content includes at least one text portion, and the prompt mapping information includes a respective prompt class associated with each of the at least one text portion, and interpreting includes using respective prompt classes to determine which prompt of a plurality of prompts maps to each of the at least one text portion (*Field (class) attribute that is used as an identifier to produce one of a plurality of specific prompts, Col. 37, Lines 8-34*).

With respect to **Claim 5**, Ladd discloses:

Parsing the information subsequent to obtaining the information (*Col. 12, Lines 15-24*).

With respect to **Claim 7**, Ladd discloses:

Encoding an XML tag in the intermediary form (*Col. 16, Lines 29-40; Col. 5, Lines 8-11*); and

Encoding a tag state in the intermediary form (start, end, and dialog tags, Col. 16, Lines 29-40).

With respect to **Claim 8**, Ladd discloses:

Generating an array representing the information (*Col. 12, Lines 15-24*).

With respect to **Claim 12**, Ladd discloses:

Parsing the information subsequent to the step of obtaining (*Col. 15, Line 60- Col. 16, Line 28; Col. 12, Lines 15-24*); and,

Generating an intermediary from of the parsed information (*tree, Col. 15, Lines 15-24*).

With respect to **Claim 13**, Ladd discloses:

Converting the information into audio (*Col. 9, Lines 11-27*); and,

Playing the audio (*Col. 9, Lines 11-27*).

With respect to **Claim 14**, Ladd discloses:

The step of executing includes returning an audio prompt (*Col. 14, Lines 10-56*).

With respect to **Claim 26**, Ladd discloses:

A voice browser (*Fig. 3, Element 250*); and

A prompt audio object providing audio in response to a request (*Col. 10, Line 58- Col. 11, Line 11, Col. 10, Lines 13-21*), the audio provided including audio dynamically generated from text (*reading a prompt to a user via text-to-speech synthesis, Col. 10, Line 58- Col. 11, Line 11; Col. 17, Lines 61-67; and Col. 34, Lines 49-65*) and audio from at least one prerecorded audio source (*prerecorded prompts, Col. 15, Lines 60-64; Col. 10, Line 58- Col. 11, Line 11; Col. 10, Lines 13-21*), each of the at least one prerecorded source associated with an identification (*prompt tags, Col. 15, Lines 60-64; Col. 16, Lines 29-40; and Fig. 6*).

With respect to **Claim 28**, Ladd discloses:

The prerecorded audio source is periodically updated (*updated audio files pertaining to current weather and stock market information, Col. 40, Line 25- Col. 41, Line 3; and Col. 43, Lines 54-63*).

With respect to **Claim 30**, Ladd discloses location and dialog tag information (*Col. 16, Lines 29-40*), as well as device information tags (*Col. 24, Lines 1-8*).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. **Claims 2, 10-11, and 32** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ladd et al (*U.S. Patent: 6,269,336*) in view of Uppaluru (*U.S. Patent: 5,915,001*).

With respect to **Claim 2**, Ladd discloses the voice browsing method utilizing prompt mapping and content information, as applied to Claim 1. Ladd also teaches storing a generated intermediary data form (*Col. 13, Lines 63-65*). Ladd does not specifically suggest storing voice browser data in a cache, however Uppaluru teaches storing voice web page data in such a cache (*Col. 14, Lines 1-9*).

Ladd and Uppaluru are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in voice-enabled browsers. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the

art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Ladd with the use of a cache for storing voice web page data as taught by Uppaluru to provide a more efficient means of obtaining voice web data by providing for the reuse of a generated voice web page data stored in a cache (*Uppaluru, Col. 14, Lines 1-9*).

With respect to **Claim 10**, Uppaluru further discloses:

Determining whether the information is stored in a cache and wherein the step of obtaining obtains the information from the cache (*reusing generated voice web page data stored in a cache that would require an inherent data detection step, Col. 14, Lines 1-9*).

With respect to **Claim 11**, Ladd teaches the method of voice browsing capable of generating an intermediary data form as applied to Claim 2, while Uppaluru teaches storing generated voice web page data in a cache for the benefit of providing a more efficient means of obtaining voice web data as applied to Claim 2.

With respect to **Claim 32**, Uppaluru further discloses:

The prompt content includes a text string, and the prompt mapping information includes a prompt class associated with the text string, the prompt class being one of a plurality of prompt classes, a plurality of pre-recorded prompts are each classified into at least one of the plurality of prompt classes and wherein executing includes comparing the text to pre-recorded prompt labels classified into the prompt class associated with the text string (*prompt text indexed to a pre-recorded voice file via a voice type (class) attribute, Col. 22, Line 32- Col. 25, Line 25*).

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

Cohen et al (*U.S. Patent: 6,560,576*)- teaches a voice-enabled browser utilizing prompt elements including type and content.

White et al (*U.S. Patent: 6,785,653*)- teaches a voice browser featuring prompt class attributes.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James S. Wozniak whose telephone number is (571) 272-7632. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th, 7:30-5:00, F, 7:30-4, Off Alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Hudspeth can be reached at (571) 272-7843. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

James S. Wozniak
8/29/2006



DAVID HUDSPETH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600